

November 10, 1998. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,572,619, issued to Judson, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,916, issued to Busey, et al.

The Examiner acknowledges that Judson does not disclose "that chat region being a real time continuously open bidirectional communications chat region embedded in the browser region", but takes the position that Busey discloses this type of chat region embedded in the browser region. See Paper Number 8, page 3. To support this position, the Examiner cites Busey at column 5, lines 40-47. However, while column 5 of Busey describes in detail the real time continuously open bi-directional communications chat, there is no description of a chat region that is "embedded in the browser region" as claimed by the present invention.

Neither Judson or Busey teach a chat region that is *embedded* within the browser region, as recited in claims 10, 28 and 48. In the present invention, the browser region is actually making room for the chat region in a shared real estate scenario so that both browser and chat functions can be occurring in the same region or window (i.e., within the browser region). In other words, the browser region is

hosting the chat region within the browser region. Neither Judson nor Busey, nor the combination of the two teach or suggest embedding the chat region within the browser region as recited in independent claims 10, 28 and 48.

Neither Judson nor Busey, nor the combination of the two, teach or suggest processing chat content for display in the chat room and processing a document or other content for concurrent display in the browser region, as recited in Claims 13, 31 and 51, as amended. The present invention allows the processing and display of both chat content in the chat region and browser content in the browser region at the same time. The Judson reference at column 8, lines 34-36 (relied upon by the Examiner) simply discusses the loading of a web page to a browser and does not discuss the ability to view both chat content and other content simultaneously within the browser region. This claimed function is not suggested or taught in the cited prior art.

Furthermore, neither Judson nor Busey, nor the combination of the two, teach or suggest *linking* the chat region to the browser so that the chat client controls the content displayed in the browser region, as recited in amended Claims 14, 32 and 52. The present invention links the chat region to the browser region using an interface so that the chat client controls the browser content. Thus, at the same time the chat region is being hosted on the browser region, the browser is being controlled by the chat client which is

feeding back to the browser region what content should be shown in the browser region. For example, chat could be ongoing in the chat region, while a document or streaming video or other image is being shown in another frame within the browser region. The browser region content is being determined by the chat client. Again, none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests this claimed element.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 10-65.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-0456 of Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich, LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH
Attorneys for Applicants

Steven Sprinkle
Reg. No. 40,825

January 28, 1999
100 Congress Avenue
Suite 1440
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 457-7025
(512) 457-7070 (fax)